- The Acro files contain 63 Arrest to which 31 are wrongfully said to be convictions committed by Mr. Simon Paul Cordell.
- In regard to the 31 convictions, Mr. Cordell's Mother and Co, prior contacted the Courts that issued those convictions as noted in the PNC Printouts and 6 of those cases were found not to be in the Courts Registries. The Correspondence that was sent and received are Exhibited in these case files.
- Eventually after many emails the Courts staff took Mr. Cordell's Mother below in the courthouse to a restricted and secured area to where they had a delegated room for archiving the courts files. Once in the room Mr. Cordell's mother was informed of the room's purpose and safety procedures that had been implanted to protect the Courts registries. The files that were searched were carefully placed in fireproof cabinets and had no pages taken out of them as a rule. It was demonstrated as to each day's entries in question to whether they were heard in the court or not and 6 were found to be in error. 1 was not a guilty conviction but rather a case he had one and the other 5 cases had never been in the court to which the PNC Printout had stated they were issued from.
- Since, the Courts Explained alongside with Acro department that only the police force's update these files and never themselves, this is exhibited in our emails and recorded telephone calls to themselves.
- The Courts and the Acro Department have also stated that it is only for the police force who issued the Archived entry as data to be able to handle any further request in respect of that information if it falls within the scope of an issued court conviction and therefore any contender to that data's accuracy must contacted the issuing force to amend any data contended.
- Due to the above that we have mentioned the relevant files that we were put in receipt of that proved the 6 errors in the PNC Printout were handed over to the police and CPS who were the issuing forces who issued them, and we have included some of these dates below. **I.E.**
  - **1+.** Since the court first agreed to the police printout being in error and every attempt by the police to prosecute Mr. Simon Paul Cordell, which they have lost against him since and before.
  - **2+.** In the gazebo case. The files were handed to the police and the CPS and asked to be reviewed.

3+. The Asbo Case, when the Legal director for the Met police for the Governance of Law for the whole of England and Wales: a Sally Gilchrist and her legal cabinet worked jointly alongside with the met police force of Edmonton North London and other such as the Enfield Council & Co. **I.E.**

a) The 6 Errored files were provided to the police and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) for review in the Asbo Response Bundle provided by the then defendant and his legal team & Co, However, despite being included in the response bundle, they were not treated as evidence and were seemingly ignored. As a result, none of the information in the response bundle was considered during the trial. This is a significant concern, particularly in the Asbo case, as it involved a criminal charge presented within a civil application. The unfair trial and subsequent conviction that resulted from this omission of evidence appear to have been deliberately caused.

b) It is plausible that this deliberate action was taken in response to complaints made to the Metropolitan Police force, CPS, and other relevant entities, which requested a fair investigation into the use of false records. The evidence presented indicates a pressing need to cease the use of these fake records and conduct a thorough and impartial investigation into the reasons behind these requests.

c) In summary, the exclusion of the Acro files from the trial, along with the deliberate omission of fabricated evidence, resulted in an unfair trial and conviction. This injustice seems to have been intentionally caused, possibly as a retaliatory response to complaints of us demanding a fair investigation into the use of false Acro records.

d) Another aspect of concern about the Asbo and the PNC Printout are that the Criminal Law that was illegally placed in the Asbo for Mr. S P. Cordell to defended himself against in court with his legal team, came without any fair arrest or interview leading to no fair investigation, even aloe he and other complained by filing the relevant documents throughout the whole lengthy process nothing was done and he was still convicted as guilty without the prosecution being able to prove any illegal accept had taken place.

Mr. Cordell was sentenced to an 8-year Asbo and without any time to be taken into consideration damaging his music company unfairly and he had to complete the whole sentence. If there was not enough evidence for criminal prosecution surely there would not have been for civil.

1+. <u>The Raves Bill Act 1994 states:</u>

*"If he commits an offence and is liable on summary conviction to imprisonment for a term not exceeding **three months** or a fine not exceeding level 4 on the standard scale, or both."*

2+. https://www.bing.com/search?q=the+Rave+Bill+maximum+sentence&FORM=AWRE

- The conviction was placed into Mr. S. P. Cordell's criminal record as he and other requested a copy in the **year 2017** to prove this fact while complaining about the injustice.

The Asbo was placed under a CBO Asbo **"Other Information / 2017 - Report 1 - Class: CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR ORDER"** In the original copy this is on Page Number: **"2"** to which his Asbo was also, a Stand Alone Asbo Application and not a criminal Asbo Order. He had been complaining about not receiving the CBO Asbo Order as he understood it to have been wrong for him to have not been arrested or given any fair chance to explain himself. At some stage the police had explained that they will delete the Asbo from the PNC Record once it is time served.

We also noted it to be titled under Disposable information and therefore contacted Acro and asked how we can delete the rest the same way and have been told that only the police can do this if we contact them.

In **2020** the Acro department was contacted again as another subject access request was request and we noticed that the Asbo had been rebranded due to our complaints.

"Other Information Other Information 1 Type: ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ORDER" In the original copy this is on Page Number: **"13"**

Mr. Cordell was still being illegally detained under the Asbo from his own free will be due to the fear of being set up again for doing right in his own community and within the scope of the Law.

In **2021** when we requested the Acro report again due to the Asbo being over, it had been completely removed from the PNC record, as titled under disposables and as an illegal crime that led to an illegal conviction.

- While we have tried to conclude the matters, we have been abused to an extent that it seemed as if the police and Councils and co had more to hide and this has led to a further investigation into the 25 convictions out of the 31 in the police printout being investigated by Mr. Simon Paul Cordell himself.

1+. Ple Date or Offence Dates

Original PNC AND ACRO File Link:
horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me - /PNC66/1. PNC-Errors-and-Its-Other-Claims/1. New-PNC-Claim-Folder/4. The-PNC-Exhibited-Evidence/1. Original-Court-Files/0-Original-Acro-Requests-and-PNC-Printouts-and-Mods/
File to use: -- Orig12-PNC-Pri

Plea Dates or Offence Dates? That Was the Question!

Regarding the question of plea dates or offence dates, it is important to refer to the original copy of the 2012 PNC printout. Looking at the first, second, and third offences listed, it becomes clear that the first date stated for each conviction is the court sentencing date. However, there is still uncertainty about the second date, which could either be the plea date or the offence date. To clarify this matter, I contacted the court and was informed that after a court conviction is ruled by a Judge, the court is no longer responsible for submitting the offence to the Acro department. In fact, even if the arresting police officer is absent from the courthouse on the day of conviction, the results are sent back to the police, who then update Acro or pass it on to the CPS.
While AI in Edge stated that the court does not record the offence date mandatorily, it does record the plea dates and court conviction date. Examining the 2012 PNC printout, it is evident that the first, and third offences listed have extensive descriptions in alphabetical lettering, stretching across the given text space. Following the description, there is more text that continues to the next line. Unfortunately, this text is provided in uppercase without any punctuation to indicate if it is a continuation of the previous sentence or a new sentencing line. Consequently, it is impossible to determine whether this text represents a plea date or an offence date.

It is crucial to note that the requested Acro Report has stated that these dates are offence dates. However, this assumption is incorrect, and one should not consider it as factual evidence. Upon further examination of the 2012 PNC printout, I urge you to take a closer look at court convictions fourteen and sixteen. Pay attention to the wording prescribed for the offence charged and convicted date. Notably, offence number 2, in 14 is "No Insurance," and has a much shorter description than conviction number 1 and three, and number 2, in 14 has no subsequent text following it. This also continues in Conviction

number sixteen which states "Handling" so, clever observation proves that the second date in each conviction within the 2012 and 2014 PNC printouts represents the plea dates and not the offence dates. Subsequently, conviction number two also becomes clearer. These findings indicate that all the ACRO printouts were fabricated when requested, and the PNC 2012 was utilized in their creation.

- Therefore, it is imperative that a proper investigation takes place to address these concerns and ensure justice is served.